

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated September 21, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the Application. Claims 20-27 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 16, 20 and 21 are independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,618,916 to Eberle ("Eberle"). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Eberle. Claims 6, 7, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Eberle. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Eberle. Claims 13-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Eberle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,984 to Dinet ("Dinet"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 and 20-27 for that matter are allowable over Eberle alone and in view of Dinet for at least the following reasons.

Eberle shows a method of fabricating an ultrasound transducer assembly using a flexible circuit. (See, Eberle, abstract.)

However, contrary to the assertions contained in the Office Action with reference to FIGs. 1 and 2 of Eberle, Eberle teaches (emphasis added) "the portions of the flex circuit 2 supporting the integrated circuit chips 6 are relatively flat as a result of the electrical connections between the flex circuit 2 and the integrated circuit chips 6. Thus the portion of the flex circuit 2 carrying five (5) integrated circuit chips 6 has a pentagon cross-section when re-shaped (wrapped) into a cylinder." (See, Eberle, Col. 6, lines 40-52.)

It is respectfully submitted that the ultrasound transducer probe of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Eberle. For example, Eberle does not teach, disclose or suggest, an ultrasound transducer probe that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis added) "a support substrate having a convex shaped non-linear surface; an integrated circuit physically coupled to the support substrate overlying the convex shaped non-linear surface, wherein said integrated circuit substantially conforms to a convex shape of the convex shaped non-linear surface" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 16.

Dinet is introduced for allegedly showing elements of the

dependent claims and as such, does nothing to cure the deficiencies in Eberle.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over Eberle and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-15 and 17-19 respectively depend from one of claims 1 and 16 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicant has made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Gregory L. Thorne

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant  
December 14, 2009

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101